



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY IN THE ORIENT.

A REPLY TO THE RT. REV. BISHOP BRENT.

BY JOHN FOREMAN.

WHEN I was in the Philippines in 1904, my American friends, from time to time, asked me: "Have you met Bishop Brent? Charming man! you ought to know him." I wish I had had that good fortune, but circumstances prevented it; otherwise it is possible that mutual sympathy would have inclined him to a more generous consideration of me in his article in this REVIEW, or even, perhaps, have led him to ask me for an explanation of what he chooses to denounce as historical inconsistencies.

We are told that my article published in "The Contemporary Review" is an unsparing attack on the whole American régime in the Philippines." As a matter of fact, it makes no allusion to that portion under military administration. The many encouraging and sympathetic letters which I have received, since I wrote the article, from Americans holding important official posts in the Islands, induce me to believe that I am not alone in regarding it as a fair, if perhaps too spirited, exposition of the true condition of affairs at that time. Nevertheless, I regret having written it, because it seems to have aroused that extreme sensitiveness in the American character of which I had no previous cognizance. I have too many friendships in America, some of twenty years' standing, to desire to create animosities.

The chief points noted as inaccuracies are as follows:

(1) "He says (p. 392) that, in August, 1898, 'every belligerent on the Spanish side in the Luzon provinces (and these belligerents numbered about 11,000) was a prisoner of the rebels.' In his book (p. 620), he states that, on August 13, 1898, the date of the capitulation of Manila, 8,000 Spanish soldiers were prisoners in the hands of the revolutionary forces and 2,400 in the

hands of the Americans. The two statements are irreconcilable." I will now show that the two statements are quite reconcilable. Every one (in the Philippines, at least) understands the expression, "the Luzon provinces," to mean all the Island of Luzon outside the capital of the Colony. My book states as follows:

"The approximate number of European Spanish troops in the Archipelago, during the year 1898, would stand thus:

Total of troops under General Primo de Rivera in January, 1898, say	25,000
Shipped back to Spain by General Primo de Rivera in the spring	7,000
At the date of the Capitulation of Manila: Prisoners in hands of the rebels.....	8,000
Detachments in the Luzon provinces (subsequently surrendered to, or killed by, the rebels)	1,000
Killed or mortally wounded in general combat.....	1,000
Wounded and diseased in Manila hospitals.....	2,600
Approximate total in Visayas and Mindanao (General Rios' jurisdiction)	3,000
Approximate total of able-bodied troops in Manila, prisoners of war (to America) up to the 10th of December, 1898."	2,400
	<hr/> 25,000

The above statement accounts for about 8,000 *regular troops* in the rebels' hands; but the rebels held, moreover, about 3,000 belligerents who were not soldiers, and therefore could not be included in the above statement. No one ever did, or will, know the exact number of these. They were civilians (chiefly Spanish civil servants of all grades), who had either volunteered or had been compelled by circumstances to bear arms against the rebels. I submit that the two statements are correct and consistent.

(2) "To what does our writer refer," asks Bishop Brent, "when he says (p. 393): 'For several weeks after the defeated army had embarked and the last vestige of Spanish authority had disappeared from Luzon, Aguinaldo's army still occupied positions around the capital. A provisional government was established at Malolos'? The statement, as Mr. Foreman puts it, is, historically speaking, nonsense." I will proceed to show that it is sense. In the military meaning, an army is a body of men armed for war. In the spirit of Article 8, of the Capitulation of Manila, the defeated army was still an army. At the same date, the prisoners held by the rebels (permanently dispossessed of their arms) had long since ceased to be an army in the military sense. The "defeated army," at that date, was that which surrendered to the Americans. Under Article VI. of the treaty, the prisoners of

war, on both sides, were released on the signature (not the ratification) of the treaty. The "defeated army" was free to embark from December 10, 1898. The embarkation commenced in the first week of January, 1899, in the steamer "Leon XIII." Hostilities between Filipinos and Americans broke out on February 4, but the Filipinos did not instantly abandon their positions around Manila. The last vestige of Spanish authority disappeared from Luzon on August 13, 1898. Aguinaldo's government was established in Malolos on September 15, 1898. As late as January 17, 1900, a party of about 300 prisoners (in the hands of the rebels) reached Manila from Batanges. Bishop Brent does not distinguish between the defeated army which embarked with its arms, and the prisoners (of the rebels) who had long since ceased to be an army. I maintain that, for several weeks after the defeated army proceeded to embark, Aguinaldo's army held positions around the capital. The period in question was from the first week of January up to the second week of February, 1899.

What remains of Bishop Brent's strictures on my article is, in part, too trivial to merit refutation and, in part, a matter of different appreciation, and I will only refer to one point, of no importance in itself, but illustrative of the disputant's paucity of knowledge of pre-American Philippine matters on which he is a self-constituted authority. He does not like my expression, "the formidable band of highwaymen," and says they "*always have been* and are now called '*ladrones*.'" The fact is that "*ladrones*" (thieves) never had any special signification beyond the simple meaning *thieves*, before the American occupation. The word "*ladrones*," in the sense in which it is now applied, is an American adaptation; the equivalent, in Spanish times, was "*bandidos*" or "*tulisanes*." In like manner, the word "*hombres*" (men), as used by the American-Manila journalists, is an Americanism, which, I understand, signifies the lower-class or the riffraff. Its nearest equivalent used by the Spaniards was "*taos*."

The sterling qualities of Bishop Brent, of which I have heard so much, preclude all thought of malicious intent in his attack on me. He is, naturally, an interested party in the continuance of American empire in the Philippines, whilst I have no private interest one way or the other, although I am of opinion that if American direct control were now withdrawn chaos would follow.

JOHN FOREMAN.